On bounding the quantum limits of estimation through a thermal loss channel

Christos N. Gagatsos,[1] Boulat A. Bash,[2] Saikat Guha,[2] and Animesh Datta[1]

[1]*Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom*
[2]*Quantum Information Processing Group, Raytheon BBN Technologies, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA 02138*

(Dated: January 20, 2017)

We find an analytical upper bound for the quantum Fisher information (QFI) for estimating the phase shift θ when an arbitrary probe state suffers thermal losses, i.e., when the probe state interacts with a thermal state via a beam splitter. We consider the single-mode and n-mode problems. The strength of our result is that the bound is calculated analytically, it decreases with the environment's mean thermal photons, and the initial state is arbitrary. We also provide a proof that the position of the phase shifting, i.e., before or after the thermal loss channel, plays a role in the calculation of the aforementioned bound but it is irrelevant in the calculation of the Fisher information to be bounded.

arXiv:1701.05518v1 [quant-ph] 19 Jan 2017

I. INTRODUCTION

Some amount of loss or dephasing is inevitable in all optical systems. Indeed, thermal loss channels are ubiquitous – in communications across fibres and free-space links as well as wireless sensor networks. Although thermal photons are unlikely at room temperature, amplification provides an effective environment of thermal noise. The quantum communication limits of optical channels in terms of channel capacity have long been studied [1–4]. Similarly to quantum communications, as quantum sensing moves into practical applications, it is imperative to find quantum limits of sensing capabilities in optical channels. However, there have been few studies on the quantum limits of sensing capabilities in optical channels [5].

Consider the estimation of an unknown parameter μ. The performance of any sensing task can be captured by the variance of an unbiased estimator $\hat{\mu}$ and is limited by the quantum Cramér-Rao bound

$$\langle(\mu-\hat{\mu})^2\rangle \geq F_Q^{-1}, \tag{1}$$

where F_Q is the quantum Fisher information (QFI) which may be a function of μ [6, 7]. A way to calculate the QFI is to find the coefficient of the second order term of the Taylor expansion of the Bures distance. The Bures distance between the state $\hat{\rho}(\mu)$ that encodes the estimated parameter μ and a state $\hat{\rho}(\mu+d\mu)$ displaced by $d\mu$ in the parameter space of μ is defined as [8]

$$d_B(\hat{\rho}(\mu),\hat{\rho}(\mu+d\mu)) = 2\left[1-\mathcal{F}(\hat{\rho}(\mu),\hat{\rho}(\mu+d\mu))\right], \tag{2}$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}(\hat{\rho}(\mu),\hat{\rho}(\mu+d\mu)) = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\hat{\rho}(\mu)^{1/2}\hat{\rho}(\mu+d\mu)\hat{\rho}(\mu)^{1/2}\right)^{1/2}\right] \tag{3}$$

is the quantum fidelity between the state $\hat{\rho}(\mu)$ and the state $\hat{\rho}(\mu+d\mu)$. Then, the QFI is

$$F_Q = \frac{8(1-\mathcal{F}(\hat{\rho}(\mu),\hat{\rho}(\mu+d\mu))}{d\mu^2}. \tag{4}$$

Formulae for calculating the QFI are in general difficult to find. They exist for pure states [7] and general Gaussian states [9, 10], but even in these cases it may be difficult to work out the formulas and to derive closed-form expressions. The task becomes even harder when one introduces noise or dephasing into the system.

When it is hard to calculate the QFI, it is possible to draw some conclusions about the precision of the estimates by finding analytical or numerical upper bounds on the QFI [11–14], i.e., by lower bounding the lower bound on the variance $\langle(\mu-\hat{\mu})^2\rangle$ described by the Cramér-Rao bound of Eq. (1). Indeed, the upper bound C_Q gives some information for the variance of the estimator $\hat{\mu}$ through the relations

$$F_Q \leq C_Q \Rightarrow F_Q^{-1} \geq C_Q^{-1} \tag{5}$$

and Eq. (1). It is worth noting that the numerical methods can provide tight bounds. However, several interesting problems require analytical bounds on the performance of the sensing set-up.

In this work, we provide an analytical upper bound on the QFI for phase sensing by an arbitrary probe state that suffers thermal loss. To the best of our knowledge, there are no upper bounds on the QFI which account for thermal photons in the environment. While it is expected that the thermal noise reduces the QFI, bounds may arise that increase with the environment's thermal photons. This can happen because nothing guarantees that the upper bound behaves well with respect to the environment's thermal photons: an upper bound on the QFI could increase with environment's thermal photons, making it a loose upper bound. Hence, a judicious optimisation is needed to obtain analytically tight upper bounds. The problem of upper bounding the QFI for

phase estimation over thermal loss channels has wide applicability in quantum metrology research as a lossy bosonic channel with additive thermal noise is an accurate quantum description of almost all optical channels.

This paper is organised as follows. In Sec. II we provide a concise introduction to the formalism for upper bounding the QFI based on [11]. In Sec. III we define the thermal loss channel, set up and explain the our optimisation technique for the bound, and prove that the position of the phase shifting with respect to the thermal noise channel plays a role in the calculation of the bound but is irrelevant in the calculation of the Fisher information to be bounded. In Sec. IV we calculate the bound for single mode states while in Sec. V we extend this result to n-mode probe states, where each mode is phase-shifted equally and suffers the same thermal losses. Finally, in Sec. VI we discuss our results.

II. BOUNDING THE QUANTUM FISHER INFORMATION

We follow the formalism developed in Ref. [11], which provides a technique to derive an upper bound for estimating a parameter encoded in a state by some unitary or non-unitary process. Let the final state be $\hat{\rho}(\mu)$, where μ is the parameter to be estimated, also let F_Q be the associated QFI for the parameter μ corresponding to the state $\hat{\rho}(\mu)$. The physical interpretation of the method is that the QFI C_Q for the parameter μ that corresponds to any purification $|\Psi(\mu)\rangle$ of the state $\hat{\rho}(\mu)$ gives an upper bound for F_Q, i.e., $F_Q \leq C_Q$. This is because one can extract more information if the system and the environment are monitored together rather than monitoring the system alone.

The system is evolved by a process that is described by the set of Kraus operators $\{\mathbf{K_l}(\mu)\}$, where $\mathbf{l}$ may refer to multiple indices (non-bold l always means single index). It can be shown that [11]

$$C_Q = 4\left[\langle \hat{H}_1\rangle - \langle \hat{H}_2\rangle^2\right] \tag{6}$$

$$\hat{H}_1 = \sum_{\mathbf{l}} \frac{d\mathbf{K}_\mathbf{l}^\dagger}{d\mu}\frac{d\mathbf{K_l}}{d\mu} \tag{7}$$

$$\hat{H}_2 = i\sum_{\mathbf{l}} \frac{d\mathbf{K}_\mathbf{l}^\dagger}{d\mu}\mathbf{K_l}, \tag{8}$$

where the mean values in Eq. (6) are taken on the initial state, which can be pure or mixed. Note that, for simplicity, we do not write the dependence of $\mathbf{K_l}$ on μ. Also, as it is apparent by now, we denote operators or estimators with circumflex (for example $\hat{\rho}$ is an operator while $\hat{\mu}$ is an estimator) depending on the context. Bold capital letters stand for operators as well (such as $\mathbf{K}$) and we prefer to use the bold capitals when we refer to Kraus operators.

The purification of a quantum state is not unique. Therefore, if one is interested in finding the tightest bound, one should optimise over all possible purifications or at least selectively optimise over some possible purifications. The non-uniqueness of the purification is linked to unitary ambiguity of Kraus operators, since both of these ambiguities are rooted in the freedom of choosing the environments' basis up to some unitary. Specifically, the unitary ambiguity of Kraus operators means the following: two Kraus representations $\{\mathbf{K}_n\}$ and $\{\mathbf{K'}_n\}$ represent the same quantum channel if and only if $\mathbf{K}_n = \sum_{n,m} U_{mn}\mathbf{K'}_m$, where U_{mn} are the elements of the matrix representation of a unitary operator that acts on the environment's Hilbert space. For a complete study of Kraus operators we refer the reader to [15].

Therefore, in order to find the tightest bound we need to optimise over all possible equivalent representations of the given quantum channel. While this is an impossible task in most cases, even a limited optimisation over a subset of equivalent Kraus representations should yield better results than not optimizing at all.

III. THERMAL LOSS CHANNEL

A. Definition and Kraus representation

In the thermal loss channel the input state $\hat{\rho}_0$ interacts with the thermal state $\hat{\rho}_{\text{th}}$ via a beam splitter of transmittance η. Then the lower output port (port (B) in Fig. 1) is traced out and what is left is the channel's output $\hat{\rho}$. Note that the modes' transformation matrix for the beam splitter operator $\hat{U}$ (the loss part) is

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\eta} & \sqrt{1-\eta} \\ -\sqrt{1-\eta} & \sqrt{\eta} \end{pmatrix} \tag{9}$$

and the thermal state (the thermal part) in Fock basis is

$$\hat{\rho}_{\text{th}} = \frac{1}{1+\bar{n}_B}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\bar{n}_B}{1+\bar{n}_B}\right)^k |k\rangle\langle k|, \tag{10}$$



Figure 1. The thermal loss channel (left) can be decomposed into a pure loss channel followed by a quantum limited amplifier (right). If the thermal loss channel is characterised by transmittance η and mean thermal photon number $\bar{n}_B$, then the pure loss channel is characterised by transmittance $\tau = \eta/G$ and the quantum limited amplifier has gain $G = 1 + (1-\eta)\bar{n}_B$.

where $\bar{n}_B$ is the mean thermal photon number. We need the Kraus operators for the thermal loss channel. One possible Kraus decomposition is found by decomposing the thermal loss channel into a pure loss channel of transmittance τ followed by a quantum limited amplifier with gain G [16]

$$\tau = \frac{\eta}{G} \tag{11}$$

$$G = 1 + (1-\eta)\bar{n}_B. \tag{12}$$

Therefore, a Kraus representation of the thermal loss channel is

$$\hat{\rho} = \sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{A}_l \hat{\rho}_0 \mathbf{A}_l^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k^\dagger, \tag{13}$$

where $\mathbf{A}_l$ are the Kraus operators of the pure loss channel while $\mathbf{B}_k(G)$ are the Kraus operators of the quantum limited amplifier [16] given by

$$\mathbf{A}_l = \sqrt{\frac{(1-\tau)^l}{l!}} \tau^{\frac{\hat{n}}{2}} \hat{a}^l \tag{14}$$

$$\mathbf{B}_k = \sqrt{\frac{1}{k!}\frac{1}{G}\left(\frac{G-1}{G}\right)^k} \hat{a}^{\dagger k} G^{-\frac{\hat{n}}{2}}. \tag{15}$$

From now on the parameter to be estimated is $\mu \equiv \theta$, i.e., the phase picked up by the input state. The Kraus representation of the full channel, i.e., including the phase shift θ, is

$$\hat{\rho} = \sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} e^{i\theta(\hat{n}+\gamma(k-l))} \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{A}_l \hat{\rho}_0 \mathbf{A}_l^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k^\dagger e^{-i\theta(\hat{n}+\gamma(k-l))}, \tag{16}$$

where $\gamma = -1$ corresponds to the case where the phase shift is applied before the thermal loss channel, while $\gamma = 0$ corresponds to the case where the phase shift is applied after the thermal loss channel. This follows from the relation

$$e^{i\theta(\hat{n}-(k-l))} \hat{a}^{\dagger k} G^{-\frac{\hat{n}}{2}} \tau^{\frac{\hat{n}}{2}} \hat{a}^l = \hat{a}^{\dagger k} G^{-\frac{\hat{n}}{2}} \tau^{\frac{\hat{n}}{2}} \hat{a}^l e^{i\theta\hat{n}}. \tag{17}$$

Key to proving Eq. (17) is

$$\left(\hat{a}^\dagger\right)^l \hat{n}^k = (\hat{n}-l)^k \left(\hat{a}^\dagger\right)^l, \tag{18}$$

which is also a necessary relation for the calculations that follow. The physical meaning of any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ (not just $\gamma = -1, 0$) is explained later in a more general context. Note that the position of the phase operator with respect to quantum noise channel does not change the QFI F_Q since the complex number $e^{i\theta\gamma(k-l)}$ is eliminated by its complex conjugate in Eq. (16). Therefore, the final state $\hat{\rho}$ is independent of γ. This has been proven in a different way in [17].

In contrast, it is apparent that the position of the phase shifting has an impact on the QFI C_Q as one can see from Eqs. (6), (7), and (8). The question that arises is: for which γ we get a tighter bound? Or, more generally, can we treat γ as a continuous real variable and optimise over it?

To answer this question let us consider two equivalent Kraus representations of the pure loss channel, i.e., $\{\mathbf{A}_l\}$ of Eq. (14) and $\{\mathbf{A'}_l\}$, and the unitary operator that connects them is a local phase rotation by $x\theta$, that is,

$$\mathbf{A'}_l = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \delta_{kl} e^{ixk\theta} \mathbf{A}_l = e^{ixl\theta} \mathbf{A}_l = \sqrt{\frac{(1-\tau)^l}{l!}} \tau^{\frac{\hat{n}}{2}} \left(e^{ix\theta}\hat{a}\right)^l. \tag{19}$$

Therefore, the operators in Eq. (19) can be obtained from Eq. (14) by applying a local phase θx in the system's modes,

$$e^{-i\theta x\hat{n}} \hat{a} e^{i\theta x\hat{n}} = e^{i\theta x}\hat{a}. \tag{20}$$

Thus we define a family of Kraus representations, parametrised by x, which we optimise over the continuous real parameter x. Following the same reasoning, we can define a family of Kraus representations $\{\mathbf{B'}_k\}$ for quantum-limited amplification channel as

$$\mathbf{B'}_k = e^{i\theta yk}\mathbf{B}_k = \sqrt{\frac{1}{k!}\frac{1}{G}\left(\frac{G-1}{G}\right)^k} \left(e^{i\theta y}\hat{a}^\dagger\right)^k G^{-\frac{\hat{n}}{2}}, \tag{21}$$

where now the family of equivalent Kraus operators is parametrised by the continuous real parameter y. Now we can define a Kraus representation of the full channel, i.e., phase shifting and thermal losses, that can be optimised over x and y,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\rho} &= \sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} e^{i\theta\hat{n}} \left(\mathbf{B}_k e^{i\theta ky}\right) \left(\mathbf{A}_l e^{i\theta lx}\right) \hat{\rho}_0 \left(\mathbf{A}_l^\dagger e^{-i\theta lx}\right) \left(\mathbf{B}_k^\dagger e^{-i\theta ky}\right) e^{-i\theta\hat{n}} \\ &= \sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} e^{i\theta(\hat{n}+lx+ky)} \mathbf{B}_k \mathbf{A}_l \hat{\rho}_0 \mathbf{A}_l^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k^\dagger e^{-i\theta(\hat{n}+lx+ky)},\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where again, the x and y do not affect the evolution of the initial state and therefore the value of F_Q, but have an impact on C_Q and, therefore, we optimise C_Q over x and y. Note Eq. (16) is a special case of Eq. (22) for $-x = y = \gamma$.

Let us here wrap up our strategy. We optimise over the Kraus operators $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ by adding local phase parameters that depend linearly on the estimated parameter. We impose this dependence of the Kraus operators $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ on θ so that we obtain non-trivial results when using Eqs. (7) and (8), as we have seen these local phases generate equivalent Kraus decompositions of the thermal loss channel. This is a special case of the local unitary freedom on the environment in defining the Kraus operator.

B. Physical meaning

We prove that the unitary equivalence we have chosen in Eq. (19) has the physical interpretation of a local phase in the environment after interaction. If $\hat{U}$ is a beam splitter transformation with transmittance τ, then the Kraus operator for the pure loss channel is defined as,

$$\mathbf{A}_l = \langle l|\hat{U}|0\rangle = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} \langle m,l|\hat{B}|n,0\rangle |m\rangle\langle n|, \tag{23}$$

where m and n refer to the system while l and the vacuum state $|0\rangle$ refer to the environment. Also, note that we have used the Fock basis for the system and the environment. By inserting the unit resolution of the coherent basis in Eq. (23) we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{A}_l = \frac{1}{\pi^2} \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} \int d^2\alpha_1 \int d^2\alpha_2 \exp\left(-\frac{|\alpha_1|^2}{2} - \frac{|\alpha_2|^2}{2} - \frac{1}{2}|\alpha_1\sqrt{\tau} + \alpha_2\sqrt{1-\tau}|^2 - \frac{1}{2}|-\alpha_1\sqrt{1-\tau} + \alpha_2\sqrt{\tau}|^2\right) \\ \times \frac{(\alpha_1^*\sqrt{\tau} + \alpha_2^*\sqrt{1-\tau})^n}{\sqrt{n!}} \frac{\alpha_1^m}{\sqrt{m!}} \frac{\alpha_2^l}{\sqrt{l!}} |m\rangle\langle n|,\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where $d^2\alpha = d\Re\alpha d\Im\alpha$. If we perform the integrations in Eq. (24) we get another representation of Eq. (14), that is the Kraus operators for the pure loss channel on Fock space,

$$\mathbf{A}_l = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{(1-\tau)^l}{l!}} \tau^{\frac{\hat{n}}{2}} \hat{a}^l |n\rangle\langle n|. \tag{25}$$

Also, if we apply a phase shift $e^{-i\theta x\hat{n}}$ on the environment's mode after interaction, we obtain

$$\mathbf{A'}_l = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{(1-\tau)^l}{l!}} \tau^{\frac{\hat{n}}{2}} \left(e^{ix\theta}\hat{a}\right)^l |n\rangle\langle n| = e^{ixl\theta}\mathbf{A}_l. \tag{26}$$



Figure 2. (a) Another valid Kraus decomposition of the channel loss channel equivalent to those depicted in Fig. 1. This Kraus decomposition is described by Eqs. (19) and (21). The local phases applied to the environment have no effect on F_Q but they affect the bound C_Q.
(b) The initial state suffer thermal losses and then acquires a phase θ.
(c) For $x = y = 0$ the thermal losses precedes the phase shifting.
(d) For $x = -y = 1$ the phase shifting precedes the thermal losses.
We minimise C_Q over $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e., over the family of equivalent Kraus decompositions defined in Eq. (22)

.

Applying the same method to the quantum-limited amplification channel we prove that a phase shifting $e^{-i\theta y\hat{n}}$ in the environment after interaction leads to,

$$\mathbf{B'}_k = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{1}{k!}\frac{1}{G}\left(\frac{G-1}{G}\right)^k} \left(e^{i\theta y}\hat{a}^\dagger\right)^k G^{-\frac{\hat{n}}{2}} |n\rangle\langle n| = e^{iyk\theta}\mathbf{B}_k. \tag{27}$$

Therefore, the parameters x and y over which we optimise C_Q have the physical meaning of local rotations $x\theta$ ($y\theta$) in the environment of the pure loss channel (the quantum-limited amplification channel). Let us close this paragraph by emphasizing the physical meaning of the optimization. The bound C_Q is the QFI for the purified state $|\Psi(\theta)\rangle$ while F_Q is the QFI for the state $\hat{\rho}(\theta)$ itself. When we optimise we make the bound tighter, i.e., we look for the smallest possible C_Q. This means that we actually look for the phase shifting operations on the environment so that the information on the estimated parameter is erased from the environmental degrees of freedom, making the QFI C_Q smaller.

IV. UPPER BOUND FOR SINGLE-MODE THERMAL CHANNEL

In order to compute the upper bound C_Q on the quantum Fisher information corresponding to the thermal loss channel's output state for the phase θ , we apply Eqs. (6), (7), and (8) for the Kraus operator $\mathbf{K_l} = e^{i\theta(\hat{n}+lx+ky)}\mathbf{B}_k\mathbf{A}_l$, $\mathbf{l} = l, k$, i.e., the Kraus operator that evolves the state in Eq. (22). We can write

$$\hat{H}_1 = \sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{A}_l^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k^\dagger \frac{de^{-i\theta(\hat{n}+lx+ky)}}{d\theta}\frac{de^{i\theta(\hat{n}+lx+ky)}}{d\theta}\mathbf{B}_k\mathbf{A}_l, \tag{28}$$

$$\hat{H}_2 = i\sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{A}_l^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k^\dagger \frac{de^{-i\theta(\hat{n}+lx+ky)}}{d\theta}e^{i\theta(\hat{n}+lx+ky)}\mathbf{B}_k\mathbf{A}_l. \tag{29}$$

Performing the derivatives with respect to θ in Eqs. (28) and (29), using Eq. (18) and the key identities of the Kraus operators

and their various moments (up to quadratic)

$$\hat{a}^k \hat{a}^{\dagger k} = \prod_{j=1}^{k} (\hat{n} + j), \tag{30}$$

$$\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{A}_l(\tau)^\dagger \mathbf{A}_l(\tau) = 1, \tag{31}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{B}_k(G)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k(G) = 1, \tag{32}$$

$$\sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} l \mathbf{A}_l(\tau)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k(G)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k(G) \mathbf{A}_l(\tau) = \hat{S}_1(\tau) \equiv (1-\tau)\,\hat{n}, \tag{33}$$

$$\sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} l^2 \mathbf{A}_l(\tau)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k(G)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k(G) \mathbf{A}_l(\tau) = \hat{S}_2(\tau) \equiv (1-\tau)\left[\tau\hat{n} + (1-\tau)\hat{n}^2\right], \tag{34}$$

$$\sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} lk \mathbf{A}_l(\tau)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k(G)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k(G) \mathbf{A}_l(\tau) = (G-1)\Big[(\hat{n}+1)\hat{S}_1(\tau) - \hat{S}_2(\tau)\Big], \tag{35}$$

$$\sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} l \mathbf{A}_l(\tau)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k(G)^\dagger \hat{n} \mathbf{B}_k(G) \mathbf{A}_l(\tau) = G\left(\hat{n}\hat{S}_1(\tau) - \hat{S}_2(\tau)\right) + (G-1)\hat{S}_1(\tau), \tag{36}$$

$$\sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} k \mathbf{A}_l(\tau)^\dagger \hat{n} \mathbf{B}_k(G)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k(G) \mathbf{A}_l(\tau) = (G-1)\Big[\hat{n}(\hat{n}+1) - (2\hat{n}+1)\,\hat{S}_1(\tau) + \hat{S}_2(\tau)\Big], \tag{37}$$

$$\sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{A}_l(\tau)^\dagger \hat{n} \mathbf{B}_k(G)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k(G) \mathbf{A}_l(\tau) = \hat{n} - \hat{S}_1(\tau), \tag{38}$$

$$\sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{A}_l(\tau)^\dagger \hat{n} \mathbf{B}_k(G)^\dagger \hat{n} \mathbf{B}_k(G) \hat{n} \mathbf{A}_l(\tau) = G\left(\hat{n}^2 - 2\hat{n}\hat{S}_1(\tau) + \hat{S}_2(\tau)\right) + (G-1)\left(\hat{n} - \hat{S}_1(\tau)\right), \tag{39}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} k^2 \mathbf{A}_l(\tau)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k(G)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k(G) \mathbf{A}_l(\tau) = (G-1)^2\left(\hat{n}^2 - 2\hat{n}\hat{S}_1(\tau) + \hat{S}_2(\tau)\right) + (G-1)(3G-2)\left(\hat{n} - \hat{S}_1(\tau)\right) \\ +(G-1)(2G-1),\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

$$\sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} k \mathbf{A}_l(\tau)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k(G)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k(G) \mathbf{A}_l(\tau) = (G-1)\left(\hat{n} - \hat{S}_1(\tau) + 1\right), \tag{41}$$

$$\sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{A}_l(\tau)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k(G)^\dagger \hat{n} \mathbf{B}_k(G) \mathbf{A}_l(\tau) = G\left(\hat{n} - \hat{S}_1(\tau) + 1\right) - 1, \tag{42}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{A}_l(\tau)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k(G)^\dagger \hat{n}^2 \mathbf{B}_k(G) \mathbf{A}_l(\tau) = G^2\left(\hat{n}^2 - 2\hat{n}\hat{S}_1(\tau) + \hat{S}_2(\tau)\right) + 3G(G-1)\left(\hat{n} - \hat{S}_1(\tau)\right) \\ +(G-1)(2G-1),\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

$$\sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} k\mathbf{A}_l(\tau)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k(G)^\dagger \hat{n} \mathbf{B}_k(G)\mathbf{A}_l(\tau) = G(G-1)\left(\hat{n}^2 - 2\hat{n}\hat{S}_1(\tau) + \hat{S}_2(\tau)\right) + (G-1)(3G-1)\left(\hat{n} - \hat{S}_1(\tau)\right) \quad (44)$$
$$+(G-1)(2G-1),$$

$$\sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} l\mathbf{A}_l(\tau)^\dagger \hat{n} \mathbf{B}_k(G)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k(G)\mathbf{A}_l(\tau) = \hat{n}\hat{S}_1(\tau) - \hat{S}_2(\tau), \quad (45)$$

$$\sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{A}_l(\tau)^\dagger \hat{n}^2 \mathbf{B}_k(G)^\dagger \mathbf{B}_k(G)\mathbf{A}_l(\tau) = \hat{n}^2 - 2\hat{n}\hat{S}_1(\tau) + \hat{S}_2(\tau), \quad (46)$$

we find,

$$\langle \hat{H}_1 \rangle = c_2^2(x,y)\langle \hat{n}^2 \rangle + c_1(x,y)\langle \hat{n} \rangle + c_0(x,y) \quad (47)$$
$$\langle \hat{H}_2 \rangle = c_2(x,y)\langle \hat{n} \rangle + d_0(x,y), \quad (48)$$

where,

$$c_2 = \frac{\eta + (1-\eta)((\bar{n}_B+1)x + \eta\bar{n}_B(y+1))}{(1-\eta)\bar{n}_B + 1}, \quad (49)$$

$$c_1 = \frac{1-\eta}{((1-\eta)\bar{n}_B+1)^2}\Big(\eta(\bar{n}_B+1)x^2 + \eta\bar{n}_B(1-(1-\eta)\bar{n}_B(\eta-4(1-\eta)\bar{n}_B-5))y^2 + 2(1-\eta)^2\bar{n}_B(\bar{n}_B+1)^2xy \quad (50)$$
$$+2(\bar{n}_B+1)((1-\eta)\bar{n}_B+1)((1-\eta)\bar{n}_B-\eta)x + 2\eta\bar{n}_B((1-\eta)\bar{n}_B+1)(-\eta+4(1-\eta)\bar{n}_B+3)y$$
$$+\eta(4\bar{n}_B+1)((1-\eta)\bar{n}_B+1)^2\Big),$$

$$c_0 = (1-\eta)\bar{n}_B(y+1)^2(2(1-\eta)\bar{n}_B+1), \quad (51)$$

$$d_0 = (1-\eta)\bar{n}_B(y+1). \quad (52)$$

Therefore, the bound can be written as

$$C_Q(x,y) = 4\left[A(x,y)\langle \Delta n_S^2 \rangle + \omega(x,y)\right], \quad (53)$$

where,

$$\langle \Delta n_S^2 \rangle = \langle \hat{n}^2 \rangle - \bar{n}_S^2, \quad (54)$$

$$A(x,y) = \left(\frac{(\bar{n}_B+1)(1-\eta)}{1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)}\right)^2 x^2 + \left(\frac{\bar{n}_B\eta(1-\eta)}{1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)}\right)^2 y^2 + \frac{2\bar{n}_B(\bar{n}_B+1)\eta(1-\eta)^2}{(1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta))^2}xy + \frac{2(\bar{n}_B+1)\eta(1-\eta)}{1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)}x$$
$$+\frac{2\bar{n}_B\eta^2(1-\eta)}{1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)}y + \eta^2, \quad (55)$$

$$\omega(x,y) = \frac{(\bar{n}_B+1)\eta(1-\eta)\bar{n}_S}{(1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta))^2}x^2$$
$$+\frac{\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)\left[n(1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta))^3 + \eta\bar{n}_S\left(1+(1-\eta)\bar{n}_B(3+2\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)-\eta)\right)\right]}{(1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta))^2}y^2$$
$$-\frac{2\eta(1-\eta)^2\bar{n}_B(\bar{n}_B+1)\bar{n}_S}{(1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta))^2}xy - \frac{2\eta(1-\eta)(\bar{n}_B+1)\bar{n}_S}{1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)}x$$
$$+\frac{2\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)\left[(1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta))^2 + \eta\bar{n}_S(2+2\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)+\eta)\right]}{1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)}y$$
$$+(1-\eta)\left[\bar{n}_B^2(1-\eta) + \eta\bar{n}_S + \bar{n}_B(1+2\eta\bar{n}_S)\right]. \quad (56)$$

Here let us note that Eqs. (31) and (32) are just the completeness relationship for Kraus operators, Eqs. (33) and (34) can be easily proven by choosing a basis to represent the operators (they can also be found in [11]). The rest of the summations, i.e., Eqs. (35) to (46) can be proven be representing the the operators in some basis (e.g. Fock basis) and performing the summations, or one can use Eqs. (31), (32), (33), (34), the commutation relation $[a, a^\dagger] = 1$ and its derivative relation Eq. (30).

We now minimise $C_Q(x,y)$ by solving for x, y the equations,

$$\frac{\partial C_Q(x,y)}{\partial x} = 0, \tag{57}$$

$$\frac{\partial C_Q(x,y)}{\partial y} = 0, \tag{58}$$

and verifying that the solutions x_0, y_0 to Eqs. (57) and (58) satisfy,

$$\left.\frac{\partial^2 C_Q(x,y)}{\partial x^2}\right|_{\substack{x=x_0\\y=y_0}} \left.\frac{\partial^2 C_Q(x,y)}{\partial y^2}\right|_{\substack{x=x_0\\y=y_0}} - \left(\left.\frac{\partial^2 C_Q(x,y)}{\partial x \partial y}\right|_{\substack{x=x_0\\y=y_0}}\right)^2 > 0. \tag{59}$$

We find that

$$x_0 = \frac{\eta(\bar{n}_S - \langle \Delta n_S^2\rangle)(\eta\bar{n}_S + (1-\eta)\bar{n}_B + 1)}{(1-\eta)\langle \Delta n_S^2\rangle[\eta\bar{n}_S(2\bar{n}_B+1) - \eta\bar{n}_B(\bar{n}_B+1) + (\bar{n}_B+1)^2] + \eta\bar{n}_S[\eta\bar{n}_S + (1-\eta)\bar{n}_B + 1]} \tag{60}$$

$$y_0 = -1 - \frac{\eta\langle \Delta n_S^2\rangle\bar{n}_S}{(1-\eta)\langle \Delta n_S^2\rangle[\eta\bar{n}_S(2\bar{n}_B+1) - \eta\bar{n}_B(\bar{n}_B+1) + (\bar{n}_B+1)^2] + \eta\bar{n}_S[\eta\bar{n}_S + (1-\eta)\bar{n}_B + 1]} \tag{61}$$

and the optimised bound reads

$$C_Q^\star = \frac{4\eta\langle \Delta n_S^2\rangle\bar{n}_S[\eta\bar{n}_S + (1-\eta)\bar{n}_B + 1]}{(1-\eta)\langle \Delta n_S^2\rangle[\eta\bar{n}_S(2\bar{n}_B+1) - \eta\bar{n}_B(\bar{n}_B+1) + (\bar{n}_B+1)^2] + \eta\bar{n}_S[\eta\bar{n}_S + (1-\eta)\bar{n}_B + 1]}, \tag{62}$$

where $\langle \Delta n_S^2\rangle = \langle \hat{n}^2\rangle - \langle \hat{n}\rangle^2 = \langle \hat{n}^2\rangle - \bar{n}_S$, is the variance of the system's photon number. It is easy to see that $C_Q^\star$ is a decreasing function of the environment's mean thermal photon number $\bar{n}_B$, therefore the bound obtained behaves reasonably as one expects that the QFI should decrease when the environmental temperature is increased.

V. n INDEPENDENT IDENTICAL CHANNELS

The bound of Eq. (6) was generalised to the case where each mode of an n-mode state is transformed by the same quantum channel [11]. When the n-mode probe state undergoes n independent and identical processes we get the bound

$$C_{Q,n} = 4\sum_{m_0=1}^{n}(\langle \hat{H}_1^{(m_0)}\rangle - \langle \hat{H}_2^{(m_0)}\rangle^2) + 8\sum_{m_1=2}^{n}\sum_{m_2=1}^{m_1-1}(\langle \hat{H}_2^{(m_1)}\hat{H}_2^{(m_2)}\rangle - \langle \hat{H}_2^{(m_1)}\rangle\langle \hat{H}_2^{(m_2)}\rangle), \tag{63}$$

where the mean values are taken over the initial n-mode state while $H_{1,2}^{(m_i)}$ refers to the standard definitions Eqs. (7), (8) for the m_i-th quantum channel. In this work, we consider the n identical processes as thermal loss channels with the same mean thermal photons number $\bar{n}_B$ for each process. For the m-th process, using Eqs. (6), (7), (8), the summations in Eqs. (31) to (46), and performing the derivatives in Eqs. (28) and (29), where now $\hat{H}_1$ and $\hat{H}_2$ correspond to the m-th process (therefore we denote them as $\hat{H}_1^{(m)}$ and $\hat{H}_2^{(m)}$), we have

$$\langle \hat{H}_1^{(m)}\rangle = c_2^2(x,y)\langle \hat{n}_{(m)}^2\rangle + c_1(x,y)\langle \hat{n}_{(m)}\rangle + c_0(x,y) \tag{64}$$

$$\langle \hat{H}_2^{(m)}\rangle = c_2(x,y)\langle \hat{n}_{(m)}\rangle + d_0(x,y) \tag{65}$$

$$\langle \hat{H}_2^{(m_i)}\hat{H}_2^{(m_j)}\rangle = c_2^2(x,y)\langle \hat{n}_{(m_i)}\hat{n}_{(m_j)}\rangle + d_0(x,y)d_1(x,y)\left(\langle \hat{n}_{(m_i)}\rangle + \langle \hat{n}_{(m_j)}\rangle\right) + d_0^2(x,y), \tag{66}$$

where the functions $c_2(x,y)$, $c_1(x,y)$, $c_0(x,y)$, and $d_0(x,y)$ are given in Eqs. (49), (50), (51), and (52). The mean values in the right-hand side of Eqs. (64), (65), and (66), are taken on the m-th, m_i-th, or m_j-th mode, as is indicated by their indices. Note that the functions $c_i(x,y)$ and $d_i(x,y)$ depend on $\bar{n}_B$ and η as well.

From Eqs. (63), (64), (65), and (66), the bound reads,

$$C_{Q,n}(x,y) = 4\left[A(x,y)\langle \Delta N_S^2\rangle + \Omega(x,y)\right], \tag{67}$$

where,

$$\langle \Delta N_S^2 \rangle = \left\langle \left(\sum_{m=1}^{n} \hat{n}_{(m)} \right)^2 \right\rangle - \langle N_S \rangle^2, \tag{68}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega(x,y) = & \frac{(\bar{n}_B+1)\eta(1-\eta)\langle N_S\rangle}{\left(1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)\right)^2}x^2 \\ & + \frac{\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)\left[n(1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta))^3 + \eta\langle N_S\rangle\left(1+(1-\eta)\bar{n}_B(3+2\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)-\eta)\right)\right]}{\left(1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)\right)^2}y^2 \\ & - \frac{2\eta(1-\eta)^2\bar{n}_B(\bar{n}_B+1)\langle N_S\rangle}{\left(1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)\right)^2}xy - \frac{2\eta(1-\eta)(\bar{n}_B+1)\langle N_S\rangle}{1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)}x \\ & + \frac{2\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)\left[n(1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta))^2 + \eta\langle N_S\rangle(2+2\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)+\eta)\right]}{1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)}y \\ & + (1-\eta)\left[n\bar{n}_B^2(1-\eta) + \eta\langle N_S\rangle + \bar{n}_B(n+2\eta\langle N_S\rangle)\right],\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

and $A(x,y)$ is given by Eq. (55). The mean value in the argument of the summation in $\langle \Delta N_S^2 \rangle$ corresponds to the m-th input mode, and $\langle N_S \rangle$ is the total mean photon number of the n-mode input state. Now we minimise the bound $C_{Q,n}$ of Eq. (67) by solving for x, y the equations,

$$\frac{\partial C_{Q,n}(x,y)}{\partial x} = 0, \tag{70}$$

$$\frac{\partial C_{Q,n}(x,y)}{\partial y} = 0. \tag{71}$$

The solutions of Eqs. (70), (71) are

$$x_0 = -\frac{\eta^2\langle N_S\rangle(\langle \Delta N_S^2\rangle - \langle N_S\rangle) + \eta n(\langle \Delta N_S^2\rangle - \langle N_S\rangle)(1+(1-\eta)\bar{n}_B)}{D}, \tag{72}$$

$$y_0 = \frac{\eta^2\langle N_S\rangle(\langle \Delta N_S^2\rangle - \langle N_S\rangle) - (n\langle \Delta N_S^2\rangle(1+\bar{n}_B)(1-\eta) + \eta\langle N_S\rangle(n+2\langle \Delta N_S^2\rangle))(1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta))}{D} \tag{73}$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned}D = & \eta^2\langle N_S\rangle^2 + \eta n\langle N_S\rangle(1+(1-\eta)\bar{n}_B) + (1-\eta)\eta\langle \Delta N_S^2\rangle\langle N_S\rangle(1+2\bar{n}_B) \\ & -(1-\eta)\eta\langle \Delta N_S^2\rangle n\bar{n}_B(1+\bar{n}_B) + (1-\eta)n\langle \Delta N_S^2\rangle(1+\bar{n}_B)^2.\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

The minimised bound $C_{Q,n}(x_0,y_0) \equiv C_{Q,n}^{\star}$ reads

$$C_{Q,n}^{\star} = \frac{4n\eta\langle \Delta N_S^2\rangle\langle N_S\rangle(1+\bar{n}_B(1-\eta)) + 4\eta^2\langle \Delta N_S^2\rangle\langle N_S\rangle^2}{D}. \tag{75}$$

Note that it is easy to verify that for $n \geq 1$, $n_b \geq 0$, $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$, $\langle \Delta N_S^2 \rangle > 0$, and $\langle N_S \rangle^2 > 0$,

$$\frac{\partial C_{Q,n}(x,y)}{\partial \bar{n}_B} < 0 \tag{76}$$

ensuring that the bound $C_{Q,n}^{\star}$ is a decreasing function of the environment's mean thermal photon number. Also,

$$\left.\frac{\partial^2 C_{Q,n}(x,y)}{\partial x^2}\right|_{\substack{x=x_0\\y=y_0}} \left.\frac{\partial^2 C_{Q,n}(x,y)}{\partial y^2}\right|_{\substack{x=x_0\\y=y_0}} - \left(\left.\frac{\partial^2 C_Q(x,y)}{\partial x \partial y}\right|_{\substack{x=x_0\\y=y_0}}\right)^2 > 0, \tag{77}$$

so that $C_{Q,n}^{\star}$ is indeed a minimum.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have analytically bounded the QFI for an arbitrary probe state (single-mode and n-mode) that suffers thermal noise and loss. The bound behaves reasonably with thermal photons, i.e., it decreases with $\bar{n}_B$. Note, however, that our bound is sub-optimal, therefore better bounds may be found by choosing different unitarily equivalent Kraus decompositions of the thermal

loss channel. Also, we have provided a proof that the position of the phase shifting with respect to the thermal loss channel plays a role in the calculation of the bound but is irrelevant in the calculation of the Fisher information to be bounded. Note that this proof is valid for a larger class of quantities, i.e., we have shown that for every quantity $\mathcal{Q}$ that depends only on the properties of the final reduced density matrix, the position of the phase shifting operator with respect to the thermal loss channel does not play any role in the calculation of $\mathcal{Q}$. We anticipate that our results are applicable in a wide variety of problems in sensing, imaging and metrology.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the UK EPSRC (EP/K04057X/2), the National Quantum Technologies Programme (EP/M01326X/1, EP/M013243/1), and by DARPA under contract number HR0011-16-C-0111.

[1] A. S. Holevo, arXiv: quant-ph/9705054 (1997).
[2] R. König and G. Smith, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 040501 (2013).
[3] V. Giovannetti, R. García-Patrón, N. J. Cerf, and A. S. Holevo, Nature Photonics **8**, 796 (2014).
[4] C. M. Caves and P. D. Drummond, Rev. Mod. Phys. **66**, 481 (1994).
[5] M. Takeoka and M. M. Wilde, arXiv:1611.09165 (2016).
[6] C. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (Academic Press, New York, 1976).
[7] M. G. A. Paris, *International Journal of Quantum Information*, Int. J. Quantum Inf. **07**, 125 (2009).
[8] S. L. Braunstein and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3439 (1994).
[9] L. Banchi, S. L. Braunstein, and S. Pirandola, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 260501 (2015).
[10] A. Monras, arXiv:1303.3682 (2013).
[11] R. M. Escher, R. L. M. Filho, and L. Davidovich, Nature Physics **7**, 406 (2011).
[12] B. M. Escher, L. Davidovich, N. Zagury, and R. L. de Matos Filho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 190404 (2012).
[13] R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański, J. Kołodyński, and M. Guţă, Nature Communications **3**, 1063 (2012).
[14] J. Kołodyński and R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański, New Journal of Physics **15**, 073043 (2013).
[15] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge Series on Information and the Natural Sciences (Cambridge University Press, 2000).
[16] J. S. Ivan, K. K. Sabapathy, and R. Simon, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 042311 (2011).
[17] M. Tsang, New Journal of Physics **15**, 073005 (2013).